[Sri. A. Thanu Pillai]

That would work hardship. Hence the necessity for an interim law. This House agreed to that in the hope that the Ministers will be reasonable. One is tempted to ask, what were they doing for the last two years? They appointed a committee. The report of the committee has been published. We know the report is really not worth the paper on which it is written. That report has been before the Government for the last five months. It was submitted by the committee in October last. Five months have elapsed. So all the while the subject has been supposed to be engaging the consideration of Government. They want merely to play for time and play with the rights of the people. Now the Minister comes forward with a request that this law may be extended for another year. Of course no amount of condemnation will be too much. This is really irresponsible work of a very violent type. I know my friend Mr. P. Balakrishnan Tampi, half awake and half asleep is coining phrases to condemn me. But no amount of condemnation can help the Government or his party. Simply they got a majority and so they think they can throw anything before us and say, "vote for this."

The House adjourned for lunch at 1-00 p.m. and re-assembled at 2-00 p.m., Mr. Speaker Presiding.

Reply to the Motion on the Address

Mr. Speaker: There is an announcement to be made:

ഈ സഭ പാസ്സാക്കിയിട്ടുള്ള കൃതജ്ഞതാപ്രമേയം, നിയമസഭാ ചട്ടങ്ങളെ ച 6—ാം വകുപ്പ് 6—ാം ഉപവകുപ്പ് അനുസരിച്ച്, സ്പീക്കർ രാജപ്രമുഖൻ തിരുമനസ്സിലേക്ക് സമർപ്പിച്ചതിനേൽ ലഭിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള മറുപടി 7—ാം ഉപവകുപ്പനുസരിച്ച് സഭയിൽ റിപ്പോർട്ട് ചെയ്തുകൊള്ളുന്നു. മറുപടി ഇപ്രകാരമാണ്.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

"I have great satisfaction for your resolution of thanks for the address with which I opened the Third Session of the Legislature on the 21st February 1951."

The Travancore-Cochin Revenue Recovery Bill—(*cont.*)

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Thanu Pillai.

Sri. A. Thanu Pillai: Sir, I was at the question of land legislation generally. Before proceeding with that, I would like also to place before the House one other fact, namely, that even our High Court, it appears, has decided cases in which they hold that some of the provisions of the existing Act are not valid. I have had no opportunity to verify it. But still I have been able to gather on fairly good authority that there are such rulings. When we try to extend the operation of this legislation for a longer period it would be fair to examine the opinions expressed by the Judiciary as well. It will not be right for us to proceed as if such decisions do not exist. Clearly, it will be wrong that the Legislature proceeds one way and the Courts the other way. We have the right to correct or modify the law in accordance with the High Court decisions. If any of the existing provisions are not valid and if there has been any ruling to this effect, certainly, we have to amend the provisions. And there is no necessity to say that the legislation should be continued.

Now, Sir, in regard to land acquisition, the principle undoubtedly should be that land should be equitably distributed. That is to say, large holdings should be cut short. Land should be taken away from holdings that have excess areas, and landless people and people in uneconomic areas should be given more lands. That is the principle that has generally been accepted now. But in regard to the provisions of this Bill, that principle has not been kept in view. It is a piece of legislation that cuts both ways. No doubt, poor people get some relief. But at the same time, there are large numbers of poor people who have leased out their lands to lessees who

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly